

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-21 and 24 are now in the case. Amended claims 1 and 18 find support, at least, on page 8, first paragraph, of Applicants specification.

Response to the Office Action

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380, Purzycki and Redford

Claims 1-21 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,178,564 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '564") in view of U.S. Patent 6,662,380 to Leonard et al. (hereinafter "Leonard '380") and further in view of U.S. Patent 4,666,671 to Purzycki et al. (hereinafter "Purzycki") and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,210,884 to Redford (hereinafter "Redford"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. The references do not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they do not teach or suggest all of Applicants' claim limitations. Specifically, none of the cited references teach or suggest a lavatory bowl rim block wherein the fragrance delivery component does not dispense a fragrance using the dispensing means.

The Office Action states in paragraph 7:

Reading the instant claims, it is not clear to the examiner that the claim is limited to "a separate fragrance source," as the claims never use this language. Claim 1 requires a perfume-containing composition. The examiner does not see any reference to a second/separate fragrance source. It is suggested the applicant more clearly define the multiple fragrance sources in the claims.

Applicants appreciate this explanation and request for additional clarity. Applicants have considered the phrase "wherein said fragrance delivery component does not dispense a fragrance using said dispensing means," to require an independent, or "separate" means of delivering fragrance. As stated on page 8, first paragraph, of Applicants' specification:

By "said fragrance delivery component not dispensing a fragrance

using said dispensing means” it is meant herein that the fragrance delivery component herein directly delivers the fragrance into the atmosphere of the bathroom or toilet independently of the delivery of the liquid composition through the dispensing means of the lavatory rim-block.

As indicated by the Examiner, the term “separate fragrance delivery component” does not appear in the claims. Applicants used this terminology to refer to the required claim element “wherein said fragrance delivery component does not dispense a fragrance using said dispensing means.” To avoid further confusion, Applicants will only refer to the claimed phrase in the future. For additional clarity, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 18 to include the additional description from the specification.

Applicants contend that none of the cited references teach or suggest a fragrance delivery component that directly delivers the fragrance into the atmosphere independently of the delivery of the liquid, perfume-containing composition through the dispensing means. The perfumed material in Leonard ‘564, Leonard ‘380, Purzycki and Redford are all dispensed via dispensing means for dispensing the composition into the flush water of the lavatory bowl.

Furthermore, there is no motivation provided for one skilled in the art to devise a fragrance delivery component as claimed by Applicants. The references use perfumes as part of the cleaning composition(s) to provide a fragrance benefit. There is no indication in the references that this is ineffective. Therefore, there is no motivation to prepare a fragrance delivery component that does not dispense a fragrance using the dispensing means.

Applicants’ claimed invention relates to a novel method of providing the dual benefit of lavatory bowl cleaning and a fragrance delivery component that does not dispense a fragrance using the dispensing means, and that further provides a prolonged scent benefit. The references cited in the Office Action all relate to providing scent via the bowl cleaning composition (liquid or solid). Applicants’ claimed invention clearly requires the presence of a fragrance delivery component that is independent of the dispenser for the liquid bowl cleaner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed fragrance element is not taught or suggested by any of the cited references. Therefore, Applicants contend that the combination of

Leonard '564 in view of Leonard '380, Purzycki and Redford does not establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness since they don't disclose an element of Applicants' claimed invention (see MPEP 2143.03). As a result, Applicants contend that their claimed invention is novel and unobvious and that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that Claims 1-3, 5-21 and 24 are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action on all claims is therefore requested.

If the next action is other than to allow the claims, the favor of a telephonic interview is requested with the undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

/Brent M. Peebles/
Brent M. Peebles
Registration No. 38,576
(513) 983-0400

Dated: May 26, 2010
Customer No. 27752